

Nixonian apparition has yet to be exorcised

When former President Richard Nixon resigned, following disclosure of the pervasive corruption of Watergate, many looked forward to the end of Nixon-style politics.

But Nixon left a token of remembrance to the American people.

And that token could literally strangle the American system of liberty that helped end

Wageregate.

That token is Senate Bill 1, commonly known as S.1.

S.1 is a 753 page revision of the United States Criminal Code. It is the culmination of a nearly 20 year effort to pull the scattered federal criminal statutes together into an organized form.

A 1966 Congressional committee began study of the code and presented a report that was far too liberal for lawmakers to agree on. Sen. John McClellan, D-Ark. and Nebraska's own Sen. Roman Hruska provided a dissenting report which gained the approval of then-President Nixon at the height of his "law and order" crusading days.

In 1974, the compromise emerged—S.1.

Legislative travesty

Inside the pages of that legislative travesty are proposals that would:

—Effectively narrow the freedom of the press by establishing criminal penalties for disclosure of any material that was deemed by vague and arbitrary standards essential to national security. In other words, reporters who sought to disclose governmental misdeeds, as in the Watergate case, would be subject to massive legal repercussions.

—Severely limited public protest and impose heavy penalties for violations.

—Excuse governmental misconduct if the parties involved believed that what they were doing was part of their job or in the line of duty.

—Increase the use of government wiretaps.

—Stiffen government penalization of victimless crimes at a time when that punitive philosophy is being severely questioned and in some cases, for instance marijuana possession, rejected by individual states.

—Limit constitutional rights given to the accused and make insanity as a defense nearly impossible to claim.

Duplicity most haunting

Most haunting of all in the bill is its duplicity—veneration of criminals in the government and no compassion for criminals elsewhere—whatever the circumstances.

It is a measure that destroys citizens' prerogative of keeping a watchful eye on the government of a democracy.

Anyone interested in protecting his democratic rights would be wise to write members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and also to their individual representatives. Letters to Hruska would be in order; he is a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In this Bicentennial year, S.1 must be defeated. Sam Adams' call to action strikes just as necessary a chord in 1976 as it did in 1776:

"Let us disappoint the men who are raising themselves upon the ruin of this country."

Vince Boucher

d.n.
soapbox

vine st irregulars TA's are bracing themselves for blitzkrieg

By Michael Hilligoss

"Hilligoss," Leonik began, "There are several items in which your readers should be taking some interest. The VSI senses an imminent attack on graduate teaching assistants."

"Really?" I said. "What are the signs?"

"Three things," responded Leonik. "First, there is the regents' plan to review the quality of undergraduate education at UNL. Second, there are the recent comments of State Sen. Douglas Bereuter (a former professor at UNL) that the quality of undergraduate teaching at UNL is undermined partly by the extensive use of graduate teaching assistants. And finally, there is the faculty work-load survey which is now in progress."

"What's the connection?" I asked.

Leonik took a deep breath. "First," he said, "The work-load survey is going to show that in several departments graduate teaching assistants are carrying as many as 50 per cent of the teaching contact hours with undergraduates. Second, this finding will confirm Bereuter's suspicion that too much of the undergrad teaching is done by TAs. And third, the regents will have a new scapegoat, the graduate teaching assistant."

"Pretty amazing," I said.

"Yes, it is," he agreed. "It's amazing because there are several points that will be skipped over in the administrative and legislative analysis of the situation. For example, with TAs doing so much of the teaching, will anyone ask what the regular faculty members are doing with their time? And assuming that the regular faculty members aren't goofing off, will the Nebraska Legislature be willing to foot the cost of putting a Ph.D. in front of every classroom? And most important, will anyone really ask why the teaching done by TAs is considered inherently inferior to that of full-time doctorates? Will anyone expose such a conclusion as the assumption that it is?"

"What can I do?" I asked.

"If you can," said Leonik, "Try to get the following points to Bereuter:

(1) TAs are frequently the most enthusiastic teachers that many undergraduates will ever have. They have a sense of idealism and love for learning not yet dulled by trying to teach at UNL for twenty years.

(2) Those TAs who are given full course responsibility (rather than just lab or discussion sections) almost always

have recent master's degrees and are about as "up" on recent developments in their discipline as anyone needs to be for teaching many undergraduate courses, especially introductory ones.

Investigate quality, not qualifications

(3) If it really is the case that TAs aren't qualified to teach, then Bereuter's time would be better spent investigating the quality of graduate education at UNL. He might note that the full-time professors he wants to do more undergraduate teaching are the same profs who are responsible for training the TAs who currently are doing the teaching.

(4) Bereuter may not realize that UNL can't always attract the best graduate TAs simply because of administrative red-tape. There are a number of departments who are not authorized by the administration to make firm financial offers to prospective TAs until July or August of each year. By that time, the best TAs already have accepted offers at other universities. Now that, Sen. Bereuter, is a real problem that needs to be solved."

Leonik gripped his empty coffee mug with a vengeance. "I'm one graduate student," he said, "who won't be made a scapegoat without a fight!"

guest
opinion

Bicentennial no gala event for Blacks

By Clyde Stearns

I have heard various opinions in regard to whether the black people should participate in the Bicentennial. I feel that black people have nothing to celebrate. In the history of the United States, the black man has fought for freedom—as a matter of fact, the black man is still fighting for his freedom. The only thing the black man has in his past worth celebrating is the fact that he wasn't born white, unless he (the black man) feels uninhibited to celebrate the last 200 years of being hated while living in the United States, the greatest nation in the world.

This nation, which has taken over the land of the American Indian, has made the Indians the prisoners of their own land. This nation has admitted foreigners of the world only to exploit them and obtain inexpensive labor. This nation has millions of people living in poverty, but instead of helping these people, Americans prefer to pump billions of dollars into other countries. For 200 years the Black has been going through changes such as these. Black people were taken from their homeland, enslaved and made to work in the white man's plantations.

During slavery days the black man was considered lower than a second class citizen. As a matter of fact, in some cases he was even considered less valuable than the livestock. He had no rights at all. His only worldly possessions were the clothes on his back.

The black man was not allowed to attend the same schools as the white man. He was not allowed to eat at the same restaurants or drink from the same water fountain as the white man. He was not even allowed to sit on the same bus next to a white man or woman. If a black man was caught looking in the general direction of a white woman he would be prosecuted, convicted and put to death for rape.

The black man has been killed in mass numbers by the

white man's hands. We find that lynchings were a spectator sport for southern whites in the late 1800s. For many years black men and women were used as experimental subjects. The Tuskegee study was one of the many genicidal studies done on black people. In this study, 400 black men were injected with syphilis to study the long- and short-term effects of the disease. Many died; the rest went crazy or blind. Some were bed-ridden; some crippled and some just suffered.

Now the black man is in a situation where he constantly is being discriminated against and looked down upon. Although there have been laws passed against acts of discrimination, they are not effectively reinforced.

The black man lives in a culture within a culture. The ghetto! If he expresses himself as being from that culture he is considered a social outcast, a misfit, "a coon!" But if he decides to discard his heritage, his friends, neighbors, and parents, to adopt the white man's lifestyle, he is

considered "a hell-of-a-guy." There are also no true black people's birthdays recognized as national holidays. Government employees get off work for George Washington's birthday. Why not for George Washington Carver's birthday? I don't even know why black people even bother to celebrate the Fourth of July. They were still in slavery on that day 200 years ago.

During his 400 years in the United States, the black man has been despised, oppressed, lynched, discriminated against, enslaved, made examples of, experimented on, beaten, killed and constantly hated by some.

For this people want us to celebrate? No! Blacks are a proven people and I know that the Blacks, my people, feel the same way I do.

Clyde Stearns is a sophomore majoring in Special Education.

ralph by ron wheeler

